

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

PARS ICE CREAM COMPANY, INC.,
a Michigan corporation, and
PARS ICE CREAM CALIFORNIA, INC.,
a Michigan corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No. 12-15598

CONOPCO, INC., d/b/a UNILEVER,

Defendant/Counter-Plaintiff,

HON. AVERN COHN

v.

DAVOUD SADEGHI, SHELLEY
TRAYWICK, PARS ICE CREAM
COMPANY, INC., and PARS ICE
CREAM CALIFORNIA, INC.,

Counter-Defendants.

ORDER DENYING UNILEVER'S MOTION FOR REVIEW OF COSTS TAXED
(Doc. 238)

I. INTRODUCTION

This is a commercial dispute in which Defendant Conopco, Inc., d/b/a Unilever (Unilever) prevailed after a 13-day bench trial. Unilever moves for review of the Clerk of Court's decision to allow and disallow certain costs to be taxed against Plaintiffs Pars Ice Cream Company, Inc. and Pars Ice Cream California, Inc. (Pars), (Doc. 238).

Unilever requested taxation of \$199,110 in litigation costs to Pars. The Clerk allowed \$1,478. The Clerk's decision itemizes each of Unilever's requests and cites to

specific provisions of the Eastern District of Michigan's Bill of Costs Handbook to explain why requested costs were denied, (Doc. 236).

II. MOTION

Unilever does not dispute the Clerk's interpretation of the Handbook. Instead, Unilever takes issue with Handbook provisions themselves, citing to federal statute and case law and using the refrain that costs were necessarily incurred in the course of litigation. Pars responds by noting that Unilever does not directly address the Clerk's rationales for denying the requested costs under the Handbook.

III. DISPOSITION

Unilever seeks review of the Clerk's taxation of costs by challenging the validity of the Handbook used instead of the Clerk's interpretations of its provisions. This does not do. Because Unilever offers no basis for rejecting the Clerk's application of the Handbook provisions to its requests, the motion is DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

s/Avern Cohn
AVERN COHN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: November 14, 2016
Detroit, Michigan